| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 10/044,058 | HEVERLY, WAYNE T. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | David E. Bochna | 3679 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: | | |
| (1) <u>David E. Bochna</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Bret Hrivnak</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 8 September 2005 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Examiner made a phone call to determine the status of the case and Mr. Hrivnak stated that the case was intended to go abandoned. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | ` |
| Daul Bl | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant | 'Applicant's Representative Si | gnature – if appropriate) |